

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

AUG 1 0 2010

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Honorable Michael P. Flanagan State Superintendent of Public Instruction Michigan Department of Education 608 West Allegan Street, 4th Floor Lansing, Michigan 48933

Dear Superintendent Flanagan:

Thank you for submitting additional assessment materials for peer review under the standards and assessment requirements of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA), as amended. We appreciate the efforts that were required to prepare for the latest peer review that occurred in November 2009 regarding Michigan's science standards and assessments.

In a letter to you on September 13, 2006, we approved your standards and assessment system, including reading and mathematics. However, since that time, you implemented Michigan's science assessments, evidence of which you were obligated to submit for peer review. In a letter to you on August 14, 2009, we enumerated the evidence required for Michigan's standards and assessments for science to be fully approved. In response to that letter, Michigan provided additional evidence.

Outside peer reviewers and Department staff have evaluated Michigan's additional submission. I have determined that, based on the evidence reviewed to date, Michigan's science standards and assessments are not fully compliant with the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. Due to the nature of the remaining requirements, however, I believe that all outstanding requirements can be completed and submitted for peer review within a year. Accordingly, Michigan's standards and assessment system is now designated *In Process*. To obtain full approval of its standards and assessments, Michigan must submit additional documentation related to the requirements related to its science assessments that it has not yet met. A complete list of evidence needed for Michigan's standards and assessment system to be granted full approval is enclosed with this letter. In addition, I have also enclosed detailed comments from the peer review team that evaluated Michigan's submission which I hope will help you in gathering the additional required evidence.

Because certain significant elements of Michigan's standards and assessment system are not yet complete, a condition will be placed on Michigan's Title I, Part A grant award until Michigan submits the outstanding evidence and receives full approval of its standards and assessment system. Also, Michigan must provide a timeline for the completion of the additional evidence listed in the letter that shows these requirements will be complete prior to the next administration

date of the assessments. Please note that, if it becomes evident that Michigan did not implement a fully compliant standards and assessment system in the 2010–11 school year, the Department will change the status of Michigan' standards and assessment system to *Approval Pending*.

I appreciate the steps Michigan has taken toward meeting the requirements of the ESEA, and I know you are eager to receive full approval of your standards and assessment system. We are committed to helping you accomplish that goal and remain available to provide technical assistance. We will schedule peer reviews in the fall of 2010 and spring of 2011 or earlier if you have evidence available to evaluate the remaining elements of your system. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to contact David J. Harmon of my staff at david.harmon@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

Thelma Meléndez de Santa Ana

Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary

Education

Enclosure

cc: Governor Jennifer M. Granholm Mary Alice Galloway Joseph Martineau Vincent Dean

SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE THAT MICHIGAN MUST SUBMIT TO MEET ESEA REQUIREMENTS FOR MICHIGAN' STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

2.0 - ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS

1. Evidence that the *Guidelines for Determining Participation in State Assessment* have been finalized; if any edits have been made to the document, a list of edits must also be submitted.

3.0 - FULL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

- Detailed description of the translation review and verification process for the Spanish and Arabic versions of MEAP and MME, with a rationale for the procedures used.
- 2. Description of the results of any empirical analyses of scale comparability for translated versions of the MEAP and MME.
- 3. Alignment study report showing the depth of knowledge measured by items on the MME science test and a plan for follow up if necessary.

4.0 - TECHNICAL QUALITY

- 1. Evidence of the relationships of MEAP science test scores with external variables.
- 2. Evidence that the use of accommodations for students with disabilities yields meaningful and valid MEAP science scores.
- 3. MME reliability estimates for the subgroups used in reporting.
- 4. The final version of the MME Technical Manual along with a list of edits.

5.0 - ALIGNMENT

1. MME alignment study report based on the new HSCEs in science and a plan for follow up if necessary.

7.0 - ASSESSMENT REPORTS

1. Evidence that Michigan ensures the timely delivery of individual student assessment reports to parents, teachers, and principals.